arXiv:quant-ph/0211015v1 5 Nov 2002

Unitary reduction of the Liouville equation relative to a two-level atom coupled to a bimodal lossy cavity

A. Napoli[1], Xiang-ming Hu[1,2], A. Messina[1]

1) INFM, MIUR and Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche ed Astronomiche, via Archirafi 36, 90123 Palermo, Italy, Tel/Fax: +39 91 6234243; E-mail: messina@fisica.unipa.it

2)Department of Physics, Huazhong Normal University, Wuhan 430079, China

Abstract

The Liouville equation of a two-level atom coupled to a degenerate bimodal lossy cavity is unitarily and exactly reduced to two uncoupled Liouville equations. The first one describes a dissipative Jaynes-Cummings model and the other one a damped harmonic oscillator. Advantages related to the reduction method are discussed.

42.50.-p, 42.50.Ct, 42.60.Da, 32.80.-t

Typeset using REVTEX

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last thirty years many theoretical studies have been done in order to understand the dynamical nonlinear behavior of an atom in a high-Q cavity. The interest toward this research area has been mainly spurred by the huge number of experiments revealing interesting features of the quantum radiation-matter coupling [1]. Many theoretical and experimental activities aimed, in particular, at understanding simple non trivial models of quantum optics involving a single few-level atom and one or more near resonant modes of the quantized electromagnetic field of a cavity. The prototype of such models was that proposed by Jaynes and Cummings (JCM) in 1963 [2] and describes a two-level atom resonantly interacting with a single-mode field. The success of this exactly solvable JCM has stimulated an intense research devoted at highlighting and generalizing the original idea and physical scenario [3].

In this paper we concentrate our attention on the coupling between two degenerate mode and an effective two-level atom. The dynamics of this extended JCM model, under the hypothesis of ideal cavity, has been recently studied [4] bringing into light the existence of purely and attractive quantum effects. It should be noticed, however, that in realistic situations, cavities currently used possess a finite quality factor Q so that it is of interest to know whether and how the predictions of the aforementioned theory are affected by the relaxation of photons in the cavity. In order to do this it is very usual to suppose the system coupled to a reservoir represented as a bath of harmonic oscillators, describing its dynamics by means of a master equation for its density operator.

In this paper we will show that the resolution of this problem may be exactly traced back

to that of two simpler decoupled physical fictitious subsystems. We will indeed demonstrate that the master equation describing the dynamics of a two-level atom interacting with a degenerate bimodal lossy cavity is unitarily equivalent to a system of two uncoupled and solvable Liouville equations. The first one governs the dynamical behavior of a dissipative one-mode JC model whereas the other one characterizes the dynamics of a damped harmonic oscillator. As we shall see, this kind of reduction of the original mathematical problem provides a systematic and simple way to express the mean value of a generic operator of the tripartite system under scrutiny, in terms of expectation values relative to physical quantities formally pertaining to the two fictitious subsystems.

II. THE MODEL AND ITS DYNAMICS

The model we consider consists of two electromagnetic modes of a cavity interacting with an effective two-level atom of transition frequency ω_0. The two independent cavity modes possess the same frequency $\omega \sim \omega_0$ but they differ by polarization or direction of propagation. The effective two-mode JC Hamiltonian model describing, in the Rotating Wave Approximation (RWA), such a tripartite system can be cast in the following form ($\hbar = 1$):

$$H = \sum_{\mu=1}^{2} \omega a_\mu^\dagger a_\mu + \omega_0 S_z + \sum_{i=1}^{2} g_\mu \left(a_\mu^\dagger S_- + a_\mu S_+ \right), \tag{1}$$

In equation (1) the atomic degrees of freedom are, as usual, represented by Pauli pseudo spin $\frac{1}{2}$ operators while a_μ ($a_\mu^\dagger$) is the annihilation (creation) operator of the μ-th cavity mode. The two real constants g_1 and g_2 measure the intensity of coupling between the atom and the cavity mode denoted by 1 and 2 respectively.

Let's now observe that the cavities at disposal of experimentalists are characterized by a finite quality factor Q. Realistic values of Q have order of magnitude going from $Q = 10^8$, in correspondence to open Fabry-Perot resonator [5] to $Q = 3 \times 10^{10}$ for closed cavities [6]. In order to take into account from the very beginning the presence of cavity damping, we may suppose that our system is coupled to a reservoir described as a bath of harmonic oscillators [7]. We moreover assume, as usual, that the hypotheses under which the Born-Markov approximation may be adopted, are satisfied [7]. Under these conditions, the master equation for the density matrix ρ of the combined atom - two mode field system can be written in the form [8,9]

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -i\,[H,\ \rho] + \mathcal{L}\rho, \tag{2}$$

where H is the Hamiltonian given by eq. (1) whereas, assuming zero temperature, the losses of the cavity are represented by the superoperator $\mathcal{L}$ defined as

$$\mathcal{L}\rho = k \sum_{\mu=1}^{2} \left(2a_\mu \rho a_\mu^\dagger - a_\mu^\dagger a_\mu \rho - \rho a_\mu^\dagger a_\mu \right) \tag{3}$$

where k is the damping constant. In eq. (3) we have realistically imposed that the damping constants relative to the two cavity modes are equal.

III. UNITARY DECOUPLING OF THE LIOUVILLE EQUATION

In order to solve equation (2), we exploit the unitary transformation realized by the operator U defined as

$$U = e^{\gamma\left(a_2^\dagger a_1 - a_1^\dagger a_2\right)} \tag{4}$$

with γ free real parameter to be appropriately fixed.

It is possible to demonstrate [4] that the operator U has the following properties:

$$U^{\dagger} a_1 U = \cos\gamma a_1 + \sin\gamma a_2$$

$$U^{\dagger} a_2 U = -\sin\gamma a_1 + \cos\gamma a_2 \tag{5}$$

Taking into account equation (5), it is easy to prove that, transforming the Hamiltonian H by means the unitary operator U defined by equation (4), one obtains

$$\tilde{H} \equiv U^{\dagger} H U = \tilde{H}_1 + \tilde{H}_2, \tag{6}$$

$$\tilde{H}_1 = \omega a_1^{\dagger} a_1 + \omega_0 S_z + g_{eff}\left(a_1^{\dagger} S_- + a_1 S_+\right) \tag{7}$$

$$\tilde{H}_2 = \omega a_2^{\dagger} a_2, \tag{8}$$

where $g_{eff} = \sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}$, provided that $\gamma = \tan^{-1}(g_2/g_1)$.

The transformed Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ describes two independent subsystems in the sense that $\left[\tilde{H}_1, \tilde{H}_2\right] = 0$. $\tilde{H}_1$ describes a simple (single mode)-(single atom) system consisting of a fictitious radiation mode, represented by the boson operators $a_1^{\dagger}$, a_1, linearly coupled to the old two-level atom with an effective coupling constant $g_{eff} = \sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}$. $\tilde{H}_2$, on the other hand, describes a new fictitious radiation mode, with creation and annihilation operators given by $a_2^{\dagger}$ and a_2 respectively, decoupled both from the atom and from the first collective mode. In other words the canonical transformation of H accomplished by U clearly brings into light the fact that the two-level atom induces mode-mode coherence properties responsible for the collective behavior of the field subsystem of eq. (1).

The circumstance that the Hamiltonian model (1) is unitarily equivalent to an one-mode JCM plus a free collective mode, turns out to be the key for solving the master equation (2). In order to better clarify this point let's start by observing that, if $\tilde{A}$ denotes the

operator obtained transforming by U a generic operator A of the system under scrutiny, that is $\tilde{A} = U^\dagger A U$, the master equation (2) can be equivalently written in the form:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}}{\partial t} = -i\left[\tilde{H},\ \tilde{\rho}\right] + U^\dagger \mathcal{L} \rho U \tag{9}$$

Exploiting eq. (3) and (5), it is possible to demonstrate that

$$U^\dagger \mathcal{L} \rho U = k \sum_{\mu=1}^{2} \left(2U^\dagger a_\mu U \tilde{\rho} U^\dagger a_\mu^\dagger U - U^\dagger a_\mu^\dagger a_\mu U \tilde{\rho} - \tilde{\rho} U^\dagger a_\mu^\dagger a_\mu U \right) \equiv \mathcal{L}_1 \tilde{\rho} + \mathcal{L}_2 \tilde{\rho} \tag{10}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_i \tilde{\rho} = k \left(2a_i \tilde{\rho} a_i^\dagger - a_i^\dagger a_i \tilde{\rho} - \tilde{\rho} a_i^\dagger a_i \right) \qquad (i = 1, 2) \tag{11}$$

Suppose now that the initial conditions imposed to the system are such that the transformed density operator $\tilde{\rho}(0)$ can be factorized into a product of two contributions, $\tilde{\rho}_0^1$ relative to the atom and the collective mode 1 and $\tilde{\rho}_0^2$ describing the free fictitious mode 2. In ref. [4], for example, the authors suppose that at $t = 0$ the system is prepared putting the atom in its ground state, exciting one mode in a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$ and leaving the other one in its vacuum state. It is easy to demonstrate that such an initial condition, in correspondence to which the dynamics of the system manifests new and interesting nonclassical features, is such that the condition $\tilde{\rho}(0) = \tilde{\rho}_0^1 \tilde{\rho}_0^2$ is satisfied. Generally speaking, however, even if the initial condition imposed to the system is such that the three subsystems, atom, mode 1 and mode 2, are factorized, the transformed density operator $\tilde{\rho}(0)$ at $t = 0$ could not maintain the same factorization property.

In the context of this paper we assume that

$$\tilde{\rho}(0) \equiv \tilde{\rho}_0^1 \tilde{\rho}_0^2 \tag{12}$$

Our expectation, both on mathematical and physical grounds, is that the solution of eq. (9) satisfying such a factorized initial condition exists and is unique.

In a lossless situation eqs. (6)- (8) guarantee that the density matrix operator at a generic time instant t keeps its initial factorized form. We may wonder whether the solution of equation (9) satisfying the initial condition given by eq. (12) still possesses such a property. We may indeed show that this is the case. To this end we state and prove the following *Theorem*: The unique solution of equation (9) satisfying the initial condition (12) may be given in the form $\tilde{\rho}(t) = \tilde{\rho}_1(t)\tilde{\rho}_2(t)$ where $\tilde{\rho}_1(t)$ and $\tilde{\rho}_2(t)$ are solutions of the two following Cauchy problems:

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_1}{\partial t} = -i\left[\tilde{H}_1,\ \tilde{\rho}_1\right] + \mathcal{L}_1\tilde{\rho}_1, \qquad \tilde{\rho}_1(0) = \tilde{\rho}_0^1 \tag{13}$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_2}{\partial t} = -i\left[\tilde{H}_2,\ \tilde{\rho}_2\right] + \mathcal{L}_2\tilde{\rho}_2 \qquad \tilde{\rho}_2(0) = \tilde{\rho}_0^2 \tag{14}$$

Proof. Looking for solutions of equation (9) in the factorized form $\tilde{\rho}(t) = \tilde{\rho}_1(t)\tilde{\rho}_2(t)$ yields

$$[\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_1}{\partial t} + i\left[\tilde{H}_1,\ \tilde{\rho}_1\right] - \mathcal{L}_1\tilde{\rho}_1]\tilde{\rho}_2 + \tilde{\rho}_1[\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_2}{\partial t} + i\left[\tilde{H}_2,\ \tilde{\rho}_2\right] - \mathcal{L}_2\tilde{\rho}_2] = 0 \tag{15}$$

As first step we now prove that eq. (15) necessarily implies

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_1}{\partial t} + i\left[\tilde{H}_1,\ \tilde{\rho}_1\right] - \mathcal{L}_1\tilde{\rho}_1 = \lambda_1\tilde{\rho}_1, \tag{16}$$

$$\frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_2}{\partial t} + i\left[\tilde{H}_2,\ \tilde{\rho}_2\right] - \mathcal{L}_2\tilde{\rho}_2 = \lambda_2\tilde{\rho}_2 \tag{17}$$

with $\lambda_1 = -\lambda_2$.

To this aim, for the sake of simplicity, we rewrite equation (15) in the following form:

$$A_1B_2 + A_2B_1 = 0 \tag{18}$$

where the operators $A_i \equiv \frac{\partial \tilde{\rho}_i}{\partial t} + i\left[\tilde{H}_i,\ \tilde{\rho}_i\right] - \mathcal{L}_i\tilde{\rho}_i$ and $B_i \equiv \tilde{\rho}_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ are defined in the Hilbert space of the system i. We now prove that, for each fixed i $(i = 1, 2)$, it must be:

$$A_i = \lambda_i B_i \tag{19}$$

To this end let's consider a generic basis $\{|n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle\}$ of the Hilbert space of the total system obtained as a tensorial product of two basis, $\{|n_1\rangle\}$ and $\{|n_2\rangle\}$ relative to the Hilbert space of the system 1 and 2 respectively. The action of both members of equation (18) on a generic state vector $|n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle$ of the prefixed basis in the Hilbert space of the total system (1)+(2) may be formally put as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &(A_1 B_2)(|n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle) + (A_2 B_1)(|n_1\rangle \otimes |n_2\rangle) = \\ &= (A_1|n_1\rangle)(B_2|n_2\rangle) + (A_2|n_2\rangle)(B_1|n_1\rangle) = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Suppose now $A_1 \neq \lambda_1 B_1$, in contradiction with eq. (19). Then there exists at least one vector, say $|\bar{n}_1\rangle$ such that

$$A_1|\bar{n}_1\rangle \neq \lambda_1|\bar{n}_1\rangle \tag{21}$$

Accordingly equation (20) may be cast in the form

$$(A_1|\bar{n}_1\rangle)(B_2|n_2\rangle) + (A_2|n_2\rangle)(B_1|\bar{n}_1\rangle) = 0 \tag{22}$$

whatever $|n_2\rangle$ is. This implies that for any $|p_2\rangle$

$$\langle p_2|B_2|n_2\rangle = \langle p_2|A_2|n_2\rangle = 0 \tag{23}$$

which in turn leads to the conclusion $A_2 = B_2 = 0$ evidently false since $Tr\{B_2\} = 1$ at any t. Thus $A_1 = \lambda_1 B_1$ and, repeating the same argument after exchanging 1 with 2, $A_2 = \lambda_2 B_2$. It is moreover easy to verify with the help of eq. (20), that necessarily $\lambda_1 = -\lambda_2 \equiv \lambda$. This concludes the first step of our proof.

The second and last step in the proof of our initial statement consists in proving that the only physically admissible solution is that correspondent to $\lambda = 0$. Let's indeed consider the general equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} + i\,[H,\ \rho] - \mathcal{L}\rho = \lambda\rho \tag{24}$$

Taking the trace of both members of this equation we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Tr\{\rho\} - Tr\{\mathcal{L}\rho\} = \lambda Tr\{\rho\} \tag{25}$$

since $Tr\{[H,\ \rho]\} = 0$. Exploiting, moreover, elementary algebraic properties of the trace and taking into account the explicit form of the superoperator $\mathcal{L}$, given by eq. (3) ignoring the subscript i, it is possible to demonstrate that also $Tr\{\mathcal{L}\rho\}$ is equal to zero. In view of these considerations eq. (25) becomes:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Tr\{\rho\} = \lambda Tr\{\rho\} \tag{26}$$

We thus may state that, being $Tr\{\rho\} = 1$, eq. (26) necessarily implies $\lambda = 0$.

Before concluding this section we wish to underline that the unitary reduction of the master equation (2) into a system of two uncoupled Liouville equations (see eqs. (13) and (14)), paves the way to the exact treatment of the dynamics of the physical system under scrutiny.

Let's indeed consider a generic operator $O = f(a_1, a_1^\dagger, a_2, a_2^\dagger, \hat{\mathbf{S}})$ of the system. In order to calculate the mean value $\langle O \rangle$ of this operator at a generic time instant t, we observe that

$$\langle O \rangle = Tr\{\rho O\} = Tr\{(U^\dagger \rho U)(U^\dagger O U)\} \tag{27}$$

But

$$U^\dagger \rho U = \tilde{\rho} \equiv \tilde{\rho}_1 \tilde{\rho}_2 \tag{28}$$

and

$$U^\dagger O U \equiv U^\dagger f(a_1, a_1^\dagger, a_2, a_2^\dagger, \hat{\mathbf{S}}) U = f(U^\dagger a_1 U, U^\dagger a_1^\dagger U, U^\dagger a_2 U, U^\dagger a_2^\dagger U, \hat{\mathbf{S}}) = \tilde{f}(a_1, a_1^\dagger, a_2, a_2^\dagger, \hat{\mathbf{S}}) \tag{29}$$

where $\tilde{f}$ is a new function of the operators a_1, $a_1^\dagger$, a_2, $a_2^\dagger$ and $\hat{S}$ now related to the two fictitious subsystems 1 (atom - mode 1) and 2 (mode 2) obtained after the transformation defined by the unitary operator U.

Let's now observe that in many physical problems of interest, $\tilde{f}$ has the form of a linear superposition of products of operators a_i, $a_i^\dagger$, $(i = 1, 2)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{S}}$ that is

$$\tilde{f}(a_i, a_i^\dagger, \hat{S}) = \sum_k \sum_i f_k g_k^i(a_i, a_i^\dagger) g_k^3(\hat{S}) \tag{30}$$

where g^i $(i = 1, 2)$ and g^3 are prefixed functions. Replacing $U^\dagger O U$ appearing in equation (27) by $\tilde{f}$ as expressed by eq. (30) immediately yields

$$\langle O \rangle = \sum_k f_k Tr\{\tilde{\rho}_1 g_k^1(a_1, a_1^\dagger) g_k^3(\hat{S})\} Tr\{\tilde{\rho}_2 g_k^2(a_2, a_2^\dagger)\} \tag{31}$$

Eq. (31) says that the mean value of the operator O can be expressed as combination of mean values of operators relative to the two fictitious subsystems 1 and 2 respectively. In any case, whatever the form of the function f is, exploiting the already known solutions $\tilde{\rho}_1$ and $\tilde{\rho}_2$, describing the dissipative JC model and the damped harmonic oscillator respectively, eq. (31) provides a simpler way to evaluate the mean value of a generic operator O of our original physical system.

IV. CONCLUSIVE REMARKS

In this paper we have considered an effective two-level atom resonantly coupled to a degenerate bimodal lossy cavity. Our main and novel result is that, under appropriate but general enough initial conditions, the Liouville equation of our tripartite system can be unitarily and exactly reduced to a pair of uncoupled and simpler master equations describing a damped harmonic oscillator and a dissipative one-mode JC model.

The success of our procedure is intimately related to the knowledge of a unitary operator accomplishing the decoupling of one bosonic degree of freedom from the other dynamical variables.

We emphasize that since both these new fictitious problems may be analytically solved, our recipe provides the key for an exact analytical treatment of the original Liouville equation. A complete investigation of this dynamical problem is behind the scope of this paper and will be presented elsewhere.

An effective way to simplify the evaluation of expectation values of physical quantities of interest, with the help of our method, has also been presented and briefly discussed.

We conclude underlining that the reduction method reported in this paper might also be useful to treat master equations relative to other physical systems. As an example, it is easy to verify that our procedure is successfully applicable to the hamiltonian model (1) revised including the counter rotating terms.

Acknowledgments One of the authors (A.N.) acknowledges financial support from Finanziamento Progetto Giovani Ricercatori anno 1999, Comitato 02. This work was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No 10074018 and supported by Foundation for University Key Teacher by Ministry of Education (GG-140-10511-1004). X.M.H wishes to thank Professor J.-S. Peng for discussions on this subject.

REFERENCES

[1] Haroche, S., 1992, in *Fundamental Systems in Quantum optics*, (North Holland, Amsterdam); Krause, J., Scully, M. O., and Walther, H., 1987, *Phys. Rev. A*, **36**, 4547; Meystre, P., Zubairy, M.S., 1982, *Phys. Lett.*, **89 A**, 390; Rempe, G., Walther, H., and Klein, N., 1987, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **58**, 353.

[2] Jaynes, E. T., Cummings, F. W., 1963, *Proc. IEEE*, **51**, 89.

[3] Shore, B. W., and Knight, P. L., 1993, *J. Mod. Opt.*, **40**, 1195 and references therein.

[4] G. Benivegna and A. Messina, J. Mod. Opt. 41, 907 (1994)

[5] J. M. Raimond et al, *Rew. of Mod. Phys.* **73**,565 (2001).

[6] M. Weidinger et al, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3795 (1999).

[7] W. H. Louisell, Quantum Statistical Properties of Radiation, John Wiley & Sons, N.Y., 1973.

[8] S.M. Barnett, P.M. Radmore, Methods in Theoretical Quantum Optics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.

[9] M.O. Scully and M.S. Zubairy, Quantum Optics, Cambridge University Press, 1997.